UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/749,108	12/29/2003	Cynthia Paige Amato	60027.0352USU1/BS030467 3156		
	39262 7590 11/24/2008 MERCHANT & GOULD BELLSOUTH CORPORATION			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2903			BUCHANAN, CHRISTOPHER R		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3627		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/24/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/749,108	AMATO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHRISTOPHER R. BUCHANAN	3627
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 A</u> 2a) ■ This action is FINAL . 2b) ■ This 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,6-27 and 29-42 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,6-27 and 29-42 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. es have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) \(\sum \) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/749,108 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 6-27, and 29-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plush et al. (US 6,532,282) alone.

Regarding claims 1 and 24, Plush discloses a method/system for managing rollover usage units for a communication services subscriber (see abstract) that includes receiving and storing rollover data elements (col. 2 line 36+, col. 7 line 25+) wherein the data include subscriber information and a balance of rollover units (col. 7 line 56+, col. 8 line 1-14) available to offset an amount of overage units used (col. 9 line 63+, col. 10 line 1-8, if no time left in current bundle then previous, i.e., rollover, bundle is used) and wherein the balance of rollover units includes unused units from a previous billing cycle (col. 7 line 24+), receiving a request for rollover data elements that apply to the subscriber being processed for a billing cycle (col. 7 line 56+), and presenting the rollover data elements for the subscriber (col. 7 line 56+) wherein the rollover units are measured in billable units (col. 8 line 3-23) and wherein it is possible to set limits on the rollover units (col. 7 line 61-63). Furthermore, the rollover data is presented to an accounting system (accounting system performs functions shown in Figs. 4, 5, 8 and

described in col. 7 line 24+, col. 8 line 1+), wherein the data includes the rollover units accumulated (col. 8 line 9-11, amount of time rolled over) and wherein the accounting system defers revenue associated with the rollover units accumulated in a current billing cycle to a subsequent billing cycle (col. 2 line 12+, col. 7 line 24-28, abstract, value for remaining bundle time from previous billing periods is utilized in subsequent billing periods, i.e., revenue is deferred).

The method/system of Plush differs from the instant invention in that it does not explicitly show the rollover units to be limited by an expiration period. However, Plush does disclose that limits can be set on rollover units and that usage units expire at the end of a billing period (col. 1 line 52+, col. 4 line 49-52). Given these features, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the rollover units could be limited by setting an expiration period and to include this feature in the invention would be a matter of design choice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method/system of Plush so that the rollover units are provided with an expiration period, as suggested by design choice, to avoid excess accumulation of usage units by a subscriber (col. 7 line 61-62).

Regarding claim 2, the method includes receiving post-billing information including subscriber identification, amount of units accumulated, etc. (col. 8 line 15+). Regarding claim 3, the billable units include a quantity of time, etc. (col. 4 line 66+, col. 8 line 4+). Regarding claim 4, the rollover data elements are stored in a rollover management system (see Fig. 2). Regarding claim 6, the rollover data includes an

Application/Control Number: 10/749,108

Art Unit: 3627

amount of units added to and subtracted from the balance. Regarding claims 7 and 8, the particular features of the post-billing and rollover data are matters of design choice. Regarding claim 9, the rollover units are stored based on billing cycles and transferred as each successive billing cycle closes. Regarding claim 10, the rollover data are updated with various information (col. 7 line 24+). Regarding claim 11, reports are created to show usage of units, etc. (col. 8 line 14+). Regarding claim 12, the data includes dates, times, call durations, etc. (col. 8 line 4-14). Regarding claim 13, the service includes a wireless telecommunications service. Regarding claim 14, the requesting entity is the billing system of the service. Regarding claims 15-17, the rollover data are stored in a database and the particular contents of the data would be a matter of design choice. Regarding claims 18 and 21, it is common practice for subscribers to alter their plan features and to update their information. Regarding claims 19 and 20, how the rollover units are handled after expiration would be a matter of design choice. Regarding claims 22 and 23, a computer controlled apparatus using computer executable instructions performs the method (col. 3 line 32+). Regarding claims 25-42, the features of the invention recited in these claims have already been addressed in the rejection above.

Page 4

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 25, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art reference, Plush, does not disclose all the recited features of the claimed invention. In particular, that the prior art

does not disclose the newly added features recited in amended claims 1 and 24, such as presenting the rollover data to an accounting system and deferring revenue associated with rollover units to later billing cycles.

The examiner disagrees and stands by the rejection. The claim amendments have been addressed in the rejection above and the location in the prior art where the recited features are disclosed is pointed out.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER R. BUCHANAN whose telephone

Art Unit: 3627

number is (571)272-8134. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. R. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 3627

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627